

THE INQUIRER

INCORPORATING THE CHRISTIAN LIFE AND THE UNITARIAN HERALD

ORGAN OF UNITARIAN CHRISTIANITY
AND FREE RELIGIOUS FELLOWSHIP

ESTABLISHED IN 1842

REGISTERED AS A NEWSPAPER

No. 5598

SATURDAY, OCTOBER 29th, 1949

Price Threepence

WEEK BY WEEK

The Cuts

IF PRESS comment is to be taken as a guide there is deep disappointment over the Prime Minister's proposals for cuts in national expenditure. It is likely that the press reflects public opinion. Everyone is sick of the word crisis. Everyone would like to know the worst, be made to face the worst, and then be able—it is to be hoped—to work to get out of it. It is better to have a period of equal hardship now and hope for the future, than the constant threat of unequal hardship to come and timid coddling now.

Russia and Yugoslavia

Yugoslavia has been elected, against Russian protests, to a seat on the Security Council of the United Nations. This is a direct rebuff to Russia. But it is only a rebuff on the assumption that Russia has a direct suzerainty over the states of Eastern Europe. Yugoslavia is under the same government and the same political system as it was two years ago. Then there would have been no objection from the Soviet Government to her election to the Security Council. The only change that has taken place is that there has been a quarrel between the dictators, nothing more than that. The quarrel may have some roots in Yugoslav nationalism and Russian imperialism, but no one imagines that these roots would have been important unless Tito, on his personal initiative, had dared to say "No" to Moscow. It is essential that these personal elements should be pointed out. There is so much talk of ideologies and principles, so much clap-trap about this and that philosophy, when in effect much that is taking place in Russia and Eastern Europe is a struggle for power between men who have a lust for it. Social systems have a tendency to hide this lust. It is probably more brutal under the social systems which declare that they have got rid of it, than in those which admit its existence and do everything to control it.

Professor Bernal and War

We can make a guess that no Englishman is more quoted in Russia than Prof. Bernal. It is highly probable that his statement that 15 to 20 per cent. of Britain's production and 60 per cent. of her science is devoted to war has been quoted in the Russian papers before it can be quoted in British weekly papers. This is Prof. Bernal's contribution to peace about which he is so desperately concerned. As a true representation of Britain's attitude to war, the statement is, as the professor probably knows, nonsense. Every Englishman would like to get rid of the whole incubus tomorrow. But the Russians will not be told that. We can hazard the guess that the figures will be written up in Russia as another instance of the capitalist threat to Communism. Most Englishmen know that this preparation for war is not forced upon Britain by American "war-mongers". War as a factor in international politics could be eliminated if Britain

only had to think of America. It is the very patent threat to a way of life that most Englishmen regard as precious that forces the preparation upon this country, and the threat comes from Russia.

This threat could be lifted tomorrow if the Soviet Government chose. If individuals had the same freedom behind the iron curtain that Prof. Bernal has in this country, if a Russian scientist could comment in a critical way in his country upon his own country's preparations for war, and be quoted in Britain as the professor will be quoted in Russia, then that would lift the threat of war from the world more quickly than any other action. The quarrel between this country and Russia is not about war or imperialism it is about liberty—not about social systems but about liberty.

Religion and Anti-Religion

There is probably nothing more difficult to be sure about—or to gather information about—than what people are thinking about religion. It is probably as easy to regard the University of Oxford as a deadly anti-religious place, as a correspondent in a Sunday newspaper has recently done, and give facts for it, as to regard the place as a renaissance point for the Christian religion—and give facts for that. The nature of the practice of religion has changed in a generation. It is well in all talks about religion to consider that. Half a century ago people went to church unselfconsciously, and practised what they deemed to be religion unselfconsciously because it was a social habit to do so. Social habit is not religion, although it can often be mistaken for it. It is unlikely that human nature has changed so much in a generation that men are less or more religious than their fathers. Under the social habit of a generation ago there were men really religious. In the crowded congregations there were really religious men, and many who were not so. In the communities of today when church going—at least for Protestants—is not a habit but a real direction of the spirit there are many men who are religious and there are many who are not.

The problem before those who care, in the sense that they are compelled to do something about their religion, is to incarnate what is no longer social habit into religious worship. They have to undertake the task of rescuing from the debris of broken habit what is eternal in the vision of man. That means a grave adventure of the spirit—as some of the problems mentioned in contributions that follow these notes testify. It is a problem as much for a free religion—more for a free religion—as for any that has a traditional past.

A free religion, like any other corporate activity of the spirit, must have an institutional life through which it can find its meaning and substance. That means a Church, a living community of smaller communities bound together by the inner ties of shared aspiration. The invisible intuitions of the spirit must find their visible expression in a living Church. The strength and witness of the Unitarian Church depends—and depends utterly—upon every separate member within it.

A FREE RELIGIOUS FAITH— CRITICISMS AND COMMENTS

I.—ON BOWDLERISING

By "Northern Candle"

IT IS Sunday morning. I have seated myself comfortably—and I hope reverently—in my customary pew. We are to have the Third Service in the "Orders of Worship". That means the "Te Deum". Well, not exactly the "Te Deum", but that bowdlerised, amended, undogmatic, expurgated thing that we Unitarians are pleased to call the "Te Deum". Obviously we cannot sing the "Te Deum" as it stands in the original.

"Thou art the King of Glory, O Christ,
Thou art the everlasting Son of the Father.
When thou tookest upon thee to deliver man thou didst
not abhor the Virgin's womb."

As a work of art it is splendid: the words full of the sound of trumpets. But we cannot sing it. And so we sing instead:

"Thou art the King of Glory, O God,
Thou art the ever-blessed God our Father.
When thou lookest upon us in our low estate thou dost
not despise our humble prayer."

We sing: but somehow or other the splendour seems to have gone. I will not say that we have replaced the sound of trumpets with the sound of a tin-whistle. That would be too harsh. But the sound of trumpets, if it be the sound of trumpets, is a very muted sound. The version is of course ingenious, this rhyming of "lookest" with "tookest", this substitution of not despising a humble prayer for not abhorring the Virgin's womb. Ingenious, and intellectually honest, though personally I prefer the version in the "Ten Services":

Thou art the King of Glory, O God.
Thou didst not suffer thy Holy One to see corruption.
Thou gavest him the Victory over Sin and Death."

Here at least the sound of trumpets is not altogether lost. The version does not seek to imitate. There is no hint of parody. It breaks boldly with the original, and in so doing attains a dignity not altogether out of keeping with the splendour of its setting.

But from the point of view of aesthetics can even this be justified? Can we play fast and loose with a work of art? Is it fair to Ambrose and Augustine, or, if they be not the authors, to the nameless poet who first gave to the world this incomparable hymn? We do not bowdlerise Shakespeare. We do not drape the Venus de Milo. We do not add some utilitarian excrement to a gem of mediæval architecture. Why should we bowdlerise, drape and add some rational excrement to the "Te Deum"? One must, of course, sing with the understanding. That is fundamental. To sing, even in the noblest words and to the most lofty of melodies, that which the understanding cannot accept is an intellectual sin. And so we Unitarians rightly pour scorn upon those Anglicans who, having their doubts about certain passages of the Creed, save their conscience with the comfortable reflection that the Creed is sung and not said. But cannot these Anglicans reply that, if in singing what they do not believe they are perilously near to committing the intellectual sin, we Unitarians in tampering with a noble hymn hallowed by centuries of usage are perilously near to committing the aesthetic sin? It may of course be said that the aesthetic sin does not carry with it the same moral turpitude as does the intellectual. But if God be the God of the Beautiful no less than the God of the True, can we be so sure about that?

It would seem that, if we are to be true not only to our intellectual but to our aesthetic conscience, the only solution to the problem is to omit the "Te Deum", or at least the central portion of it, entirely from our services. Such a decision cannot be taken without regret. No one would regret it more than I. But every faith demands a sacrifice; and, if need be, the sacrifice must be made. The sacrifice will not end with the "Te Deum". I doubt whether the Christmas

hymn "O Come All Ye Faithful" can be sung by Unitarians without such undue violence to the original as to amount to an aesthetic sin. And there are other such. These too must go. But the melancholy process of elimination need not be carried to excess. We do not need to copy the puritanical fervour of Cromwellian Roundheads who smashed for the mere love of smashing. The hymn for Trinity Sunday, "Holy, Holy, Holy, Lord God Almighty", can be adapted to Unitarian worship with so little change of wording that it would be pedantic to lose so splendid an outburst of praise for so small a verbal scruple.

We cannot sing "God in three persons, blessed Trinity"; but we can sing "Who wast and art and evermore shalt be". The words, it must be confessed, read somewhat tamely, as most emendations do. But sung lustily to a stirring and familiar tune they sound well enough, and in singing them I do not think that we need regard ourselves as indulging in anything aesthetically improper. For the hymn, although addressed to the Trinity, is not *about* the Trinity. There is nothing dogmatic in it: it is simply a paean of praise. It can therefore be as properly addressed to the One God as to the Three. Just as prayers originally addressed to Christ can by Unitarians be properly addressed to God. But the "Te Deum" and the hymn "O Come All Ye Faithful" are definitely dogmatic. They are *about* something—something in which we cannot believe. We can only sing them if we take not only the words but the ideas and twist them into something else. This surely is putting new wine into old wine-skins, and the inevitable result will follow. The wine-skins are burst, and the wine is spilled. Spilled, because new truth conveyed in old words loses half its power.

Not perhaps for us. Accustomed to new wine, we can appreciate it in old wine-skins. But what of the stranger in our midst? What of that casual visitor who on this Sunday morning when we are singing the "Te Deum" has strayed into our pews? Coming maybe from an Anglican church, dissatisfied with the old wine-skins, he is seeking the new wine. And he finds a strange amalgam of new and old, old wine-skins burst and patched. He may admire our intellectual honesty, but he will find it hard to pardon our aesthetic sin. And so do I.

2.—ON THE PERFECTIBILITY OF MANKIND

By Harry Maguire

(The Rev. Harry Maguire of Banbury attended the conference of the Department of Social Service recently held in Birmingham and reported in this issue. He has reacted in the following manner.)

HAVE WE Unitarians lost our faith in the perfectibility of man? Have we lost the conviction of the divine spark within all men? Do we, with our long history of saints and martyrs, scholars and social workers, believe that dread of results to the person and lust for power over others motivate the energies of even the average man? Are we so ignorant of psychology and so devoid of knowledge of educational theory as to believe that the normal child can find happiness otherwise than in growing in physical, mental and moral stature, in progressive acts of self-expression and creation? Do we not believe that the child is father to the man? Are we now sure that the joy in craftsmanship and the satisfactions of accomplishment, being labour's own reward and the most essential of its demands, is all no more?

It is true that in the growth of a child there will be found destructive periods. These are analogous to the analysis which in the adult precedes synthesis and creation or reconstruction. Only if frustrated or inhibited in the child do they return in the adult or in the adolescent period showing itself in anti-social actions or other disastrous effects. No normal child or normal adult is happy doing nothing, unless it be the nothing of re-creation after exhaustion of some kind.

In spite of the powerful pressure exerted by the common notion of the "Evil" of work, probably a legacy of orthodox Christianity and of the influence of films, books and plays blandishing the lure of luxury in idleness, the average person not only knows deep down in his heart that all wealth is the

product of work, but he is not really happy unless somehow he feels he is doing his share in that work. But he does want what he thinks is justice.

Man is evil. Granted! But man is good, too, and the natural and spontaneous urges to the good, towards community and away from self, are greater. That is a Christian belief. It is the faith on which we have so far worked. Poets like Wordsworth and modernists like D. H. Lawrence have been certain that this faith is well grounded and that only the crushing weight of what Tawney called "An Acquisitive Society" crushes the "Growing Wings" of the child. The point is that if we do not believe in this essential goodness of man we might as well give up our efforts on his behalf, our Social Service department and indeed the whole of Unitarianism itself.

If, however, we do still believe that men find joy in labour, i.e., satisfaction in using mind, muscle, spirit and will, heightened by the knowledge that the results may benefit not only the self but the community, we immediately enlarge the number of incentives towards the greater amount of work and of better quality required to usher in our better order of society.

There are the material rewards direct and indirect; there are the psychological adjustments necessary and closely related to the spiritual incentives when by wise adult educative methods the worker is enabled to realise that this labour is indeed a contribution to his own and the general welfare. He counts; there is the kind of enlightenment outlined by E. S. Price at a ministers' meeting, given by the industrial psychologists where workers are made aware that even their most monotonous and most repetitive work is related to the end results and therefore has value, social value. These we might call short term policies and means of influencing the workers of society. Their value will be enhanced when the worker is assured that all men are workers in it or that society is moving towards a state where there are no spivs or drones.

Perhaps more important still are what we might call the long term policies which need and could be initiated now. The need is urgent because our dense and complex society has come to stay. The machine has come to stay. Moreover, the essence of Socialism, viz., that the wealth made by society must somehow be equitably distributed amongst society, that also has come to stay. Not only is this so but the generality of workers will not again allow fear to be the dominant incentive to their labouring. Gone is that day, and for politicians to try and bring it back is to invite the spectacle we have seen in the East.

The long term solution lies in the making of a people fit to live and capable therefore of constructing the new social order.

If we as Unitarians could preach some such gospel, we should have the answer to the Communists' claim that religion is the opiate of the people or "Pie in the sky". We could show them what Communism really meant.

3.—ON TRUTH AND TRADITION

By Eric Glasgow

THOSE whose spiritual pilgrimage has been somewhat similar to that of the author of "Progress Report", printed in last week's INQUIRER, will have read his remarks with particular interest and profit. Having myself left the orthodox fold not so very long ago, I may perhaps say that the step is often painful and may be dangerous, especially if the conversion is merely intellectual. It is easy to allow the theoretical basis of religion to overshadow its spiritual essence, and in modifying the one to lose touch with the other. The outcome may be not only instability of judgment but also a cold imperviousness towards religion itself, as happened in the case of the historian Gibbon, for instance; and I imagine that any Church would wish to concentrate its missionary activity mainly upon those who are outside organised religion altogether. Conversion elsewhere is apt to appear too expensive in human terms, and one is tempted to suggest that it is better to swallow a few out-moded dogmas than to cause division and argument. After all, tradition is valuable, and so is unity. Anyone who ventures to criticise doctrine is sure to do less than justice to his positive convictions, which are perhaps the ones which

really matter, so why not fall back upon the practical details of Christian living and remain silent within the fold?

It is an insidious line of reasoning which many must have faced and not a few have had to reject, albeit with genuine reluctance. Tradition, to be acceptable, must be allowed to grow and develop, and unity is less important than truth. Nebulous as the concept of truth sometimes seems, neglect of it ultimately strikes at the roots of all the other values and we cannot be too exacting in our standards, even if it means discarding some of the beliefs we imbibed when young. Charles Hargrove springs to mind as an example; his extraordinary career is well-known. After an austere Calvinist upbringing, he not only joined the Roman Catholic Church but was even for some years a Benedictine monk. His mind was, however, too independent to be permanently satisfied with such a life, so he returned to the world to deliver Extension Lectures on English Literature for Cambridge University, until he at last found soul's ease as a Unitarian and as minister of Mill Hill Chapel, Leeds. He had thus every reason to ask himself whether it was good to change one's opinions, if necessary, and in a sermon of his, printed at the end of Dr. Jacks' biography *From Authority to Freedom*, he points out that a broader outlook, a deeper understanding and a more direct contact with spiritual reality should result from moving as the mind and heart decree.

That the Church of England should be at present prepared to give so little encouragement to this kind of development is one of the most lamentable and disquieting features of our time. On any showing it is a great institution, and many even of those outside would like to see it play its rightful part in the cause of progressive Christianity. Alas for the dream, however, for Dr. Barnes and his like seem destined to dwell increasingly in the wilderness, as the challenge inherent in Communism provokes the familiar clerical reaction against change of any kind. At the beginning of his August Bank Holiday mission in Southport last summer, the Bishop of Liverpool remarked that he had "no patience with those who want a new religion". Such an observation can only fill with dismay those who believe in a progressive revelation and a close alliance between Christian spiritual perceptions and the accredited findings of modern knowledge.

THE MOST VITAL OF ALL CHRISTIAN DOCTRINES

By G. Randall Jones, B.D.

THE deacons of Little Bethel had invited "the Ministers of Other Denominations" to their Anniversary Tea Party, and they were wondering whether the Unitarian minister be included in the invitation. "The Unitarians are quite wrong in their doctrine, of course", said the youngest deacon, "but we've got to admit that they are good people—honest, clean-living, reliable, and all that sort of thing". "They'd better be", explained the oldest deacon; "you see, they've got no Atonement".

The old man was right, but not quite right. What he meant was that the Unitarians rejected his *particular interpretation* of the Atonement. If we trace Unitarianism back through Socinianism, we may say as a matter of history that Unitarianism began as a protest against certain notions about the Trinity. It was their doctrine of the Atonement which led the Socinians to question the doctrine of the Trinity, and not the other way round.

An American theologian, the late Professor Josiah Royce, speaks of "the most vital of all Christian teaching, the doctrine of the Atonement". He is right—the doctrine of the Atonement is the most vital doctrine. But, strange as it may seem, there is no such thing as an "orthodox" doctrine of the Atonement. What we have is a very considerable number of rival doctrines, and no Church Council has made a final and definite pronouncement on the subject. It is still an "open question".

Consequently, if Unitarians care to formulate a doctrine of the Atonement, their doctrine will have the same authority in the eyes of the learned theological world, and in the eyes of the workaday world, as the doctrine formulated by, say,

the Church of Rome. That is to say, it will have the authority of whatever measure of truth it may contain—an inward authority, manifested externally by its ability to persuade and constrain the hearts and souls of men. Can such a doctrine be formulated in such terms that it will speak with power to the condition of the men and women of the twentieth century? I think it can.

But it cannot be done easily. Much hard thought, and much further study—especially along lines indicated by recent psychological investigations—will be needed before we can put forward a doctrine of the Atonement which “rings true” as an explanation of the deepest experiences of the men and women of our age. And before we are ready to begin this further study, we must develop a capacity to enter into sympathetic understanding of the numerous doctrines of the Atonement put forward by the great thinkers of earlier ages. Else we may merit the rebuke of Goethe, when he said: “The ignorant start questions which have been already answered thousands of years ago by the wise”.

For this reason, I would warmly commend a recent book by the late Dr. T. H. Hughes, entitled *The Atonement*, published by Allen & Unwin, at 15s. It is a masterly examination of the various theories and the more recent trends of thought with regard to Sin and Salvation. Some of the theories seem so strange—so dishonouring to God and man—that, at first, we may wonder how they came to be formulated. But, as Dr. Hughes points out, they were formulated because men had passed through a certain experience, and they wanted to explain the experience. Their explanations may be defective, but their experience was real.

If I write critically about Dr. Hughes' book, I hope no one will think that I fail to appreciate it. It is a very valuable work, the fruit of vast reading and massive scholarship. It ought to have a place in the library of every theological student. But the total impression it leaves on my mind is that something is lacking.

Dr. Hughes examines and classifies the numerous theories about the Atonement put forward by outstanding thinkers, chiefly in Britain, during the past fifty or sixty years. He finds some elements of truth in all of them, and therein I think he is right—profoundly right. But when he comes to formulate his own positive and constructive conclusions, it seems to me that he loses grip. I get the impression that he is trying to find truth amid the welter of conflicting opinions, almost as though he were saying: “here are the various theories that men have held. There is some truth in all of them. Therefore the fuller truth is somewhere among them, in some compromise between them.”

I do not believe that truth is found in that way. It does not lie amid the welter of conflicting opinions; it lies above them. It is not reached by a compromise between them; it is achieved by a synthesis which includes all the elements of truth in all of them. A synthesis is a new creation, derived from what has gone before, yet utterly unlike all that has gone before. I find no such synthesis in Dr. Hughes' book.

The most positive and constructive suggestion which he makes is made timidly and with hesitation, and I think it is an unsound suggestion. It is this: according to Dr. Hughes, we may suppose “that God was somehow involved or implicated in human sin and its consequences, that a certain sense of this was in His moral consciousness, and that His effort at Atonement was an attempt to rectify a situation in which He felt Himself implicated, and so find solace for His moral sense”. I cannot admit that. God has no need to “find solace for His moral sense”. That Dr. Hughes can make such a suggestion seems to me to indicate that his theory of the Atonement does not “ring true”.

I would put it like this: Whatever God does is right. He made man; therefore it was right that man should be made. But some will say: “God made man in such fashion that man is a sinner; therefore God is implicated in human sin and its consequences”. Not so! God made man in such fashion that the possibility of sin was open to man; therefore it was right that the possibility of sin should be open to man. Someone—I think it was Martineau—has said: “A world which no evil could invade would be a world which no character could inhabit”. It is the possibility of sin which makes possible the achievement of righteousness. That would be my answer to Dr. Hughes' problem, and I see no need

to bring in the assumption of a God whose effort at Atonement was an attempt to find solace for His moral sense.

Listening to a play in the B.B.C. Home Service the other day, I sat up with a jerk when one of the characters remarked: “If I were God and wanted people to be good, I'd come down from Heaven and start knocking their heads together”. I think I see the germ of a bright idea in that remark. There has been quite a lot of knocking of heads together during the past decade. Perhaps God is behind the process; perhaps He is *in* the process. Perhaps the Cross that was raised on the hill outside Jerusalem is a symbol of the way whereby the Ever-loving Father is ever seeking to bring His sons and daughters into at-one-ment with Himself.

By way of footnote: some readers of THE INQUIRER may think that Dr. Hughes attaches undue weight to the authority of Scripture, as distinct from the authority of human experience. It is worth while, therefore, to draw attention to a booklet issued by the “Friends of Dr. Williams's Library”, on “Literary Criticism, Common Sense, and the Bible”, by Sir Frederic Kenyon, published at 2s. The author's contention is that scientific criticism of the Biblical literature “establishes it on a very firm basis of historical probability”. Even so, a doctrine of the Atonement which shall speak to the condition of the peoples of the twentieth century must be broad-based on the spiritual experience of all men everywhere, for the Love of God—the Love which flamed in Galilee—is not limited by the frontiers of Galilee, nor confined to the disciples of the Great Galilean.

The article “Progress Report” printed last week has attracted much attention. There was an extra number of copies printed. Write up for more copies. It is an article that should be read by every Unitarian.

NEXT WEEK—TWELVE PAGE NUMBER.

CORRESPONDENCE

Letters should be addressed to the Editor, “The Inquirer”, 14 Gordon Square, London, W.C.1. They should not in general exceed three to four hundred words in length.

(We have received many more letters than we can print. The shortest and most succinct letters are those which will cause the least disappointment to our correspondents.)

“PROGRESS REPORT”

SIR.—Having belonged to the Established Church (S.S. teacher, etc.) till I was 24, I feel sorry if your readers should judge her ministers by “Progress Report”. My experience was very different. My vicar said he was very sorry to lose me but hoped we should always be friends and that I would come to see him whenever I liked. I remember he said, “I don't agree with you but I respect you very much and always shall”. (This from a man who was probably twice my age!) Another clergyman (C. of E.) told me, “Your choice is a question you alone can answer, and whichever way you answer it, there is no dishonesty involved”.

In fairness to the church in which I was brought up, I would like to try to give a happier impression than that of “Durotrix” of her attitude towards a heretic.

(Name and address supplied.—En.) G. T. C.

WORLD FEDERATION

SIR.—In THE INQUIRER of October 22, E. M. Unsworth, writing on the subject of world federation, says “it is intended to hold a ballot on the question in 1950 in order to allow the people of the world to speak, instead of the professional politicians”. A world ballot must imply that everyone is allowed to vote. There would appear to be certain difficulties in organising such a large undertaking in one year from now. How can it be arranged, for instance, that all the people in U.S.S.R., including the ten million who are said to be in prison camps, shall have an opportunity of recording their secret votes? Would the present government of South Africa allow the Kaffirs to exercise this franchise? Will the hardly yet established Communist Government of China be willing or able to provide suitable voting facilities for its millions of subjects?

It may be said that these difficulties are only details but they seem to be rather formidable ones.—Yours, Stephen Lee.

Rhettill, Gower.

SIR.—E. M. Unsworth poses the question, “Is there less liberty in this country since it became the United Kingdom of England, Scotland and Wales?” As a Welshman I would say Yes, definitely! My native language was banished officially for centuries as a result of the union and has only succeeded in regaining its rightful place in education during the last 20 years. In many spheres it is still banished to the great disadvantage of a person who speaks it as his mother tongue. Secondly as a matter of government the Union

demonstrated the truth of the assertion that the most powerful will impose its will on the rest. As late as April, 1947, when the Conscriptio Bill was before Parliament, 20 Welsh members of Parliament voted against the Bill while 12 voted for it. If a member's vote stands for the democracy then the people of Wales were definitely against conscription. But since we were united to a larger power the will of a little nation was flouted. I do not think that my friend Mr. Viney would approve of that!—Yours, D. Jacob Davis.
Aberdare.

Sir,—World Government is such a fine ideal that one hesitates to criticise movements for regional federation that could be accepted as tending to do away with rivalry between nations.

But is it not a fact that the proposal now before the House Foreign Affairs Committee of the United States for federation of the United States, the United Kingdom, the British Empire, and the Western European powers (subject of comment in *The Observer*, October 16) may have two very dangerous possibilities—the creation of a new vast military bloc under American direction; and the limitation of British efforts to establish the Welfare State at home and to extend its principle throughout the Commonwealth?—Yours, Swansea. John Jennings.

Sir,—Had Miss Barr and Mrs. Unsworth read my letter carefully they would have realised that I was not pouring scorn on a cause which some Unitarians have adopted.

I was only asking that these should have the humility to realise that some of us, and some young people amongst us, find it difficult to see the issues of Federation as simple ones and that it is a mistake to link any cause such as this with Unitarianism.

I do understand what this movement is trying to achieve but unfortunately we have to deal with facts as they are and not as we would have them to be, and I say at the present time and within a foreseeable future such attempts would degenerate into the powerful overruling the rest.—Yours, M. M. Stych.
Taunton.

Sir,—In Miss Barr's letter I read with dismay the scathing attack she made upon senior members of congregations with regard to their treatment of youth. Miss Barr admits in her letter that for years she has been "out of touch" with the day to day life of our churches. How then is it possible for her to pass judgment on the many noble men and women throughout the land, who for so long have laboured and given of their best for youth in our Sunday Schools and are still doing so. Does Miss Barr not know that one can be old in years but ever young in spirit?—Yours, M. Venner.
Taunton, Somerset.

Sir,—The letter of M. M. Stych, expresses, I believe, the sound policy.

Some of us do not wish to see the influence and resources of our religious organisation used to promote the political idea of World Federation. It is an impracticable means of securing World peace—one which ignores reality and the law of evolutionary progress and has within it the seeds of aggressive domination.

It deflects, too, the cause of international peace from its surer channel—that of the development of international law.—Yours, Hilda Maddison.
Hornsea, E. Yorks.

THE LORD'S PRAYER

Sir,—If "lead us not into temptation" implies that God is of such a nature as to be willing and able to tempt us, then in all sincerity I must withhold my worship.

A good human father would not deliberately put moral temptation before his child nor would he submit his child to the test of bodily agony or mental terror. A father capable of such action might well find the law-courts, not to mention public opinion and the N.S.P.C.C., against him.

If God is good—and he is only worthy of worship if he is at least as good as the best human fathers—then not even the Divine prerogative can admit the tempting function.

Moreover, no amount either of purely subjective interpretation, or that pseudo-scholarship which would mesmerise us by reference to the aorist imperative, can successfully explain away what is and probably always will be a stumbling block of offence to the thoughtful.

I remember, some years ago, when as a student I was called upon to preach a "practice" sermon, I chose the "Lord's Prayer" and spoke forthright. I was made to feel that I had touched upon Unitarianism's sacred core: that I had gone too far and needed to be gently brought back to the orthodox pathway.

Needless to say, I still consistently forbear either to say or chant the questionable phrase.—Yours, David Ward.

P.S.—Dare you publish this?

[Why not? But what on earth is "Unitarianism's sacred core"? We have received many letters on the Lord's Prayer. We hope to print selections next week.—Ed.]

LONDON CHURCHES

Sir,—I send my congratulations to Mr. Causbrook for his plan for the "Stabilisation of the Unitarian Ministry" and to yourself for publishing it. As to its being "ahead of the times" I consider it to be 50 years late.—Yours, F. W. Barber.
Richmond.

Mr. Vaughan Lewis, that indefatigable Unitarian layman of Cambridge, has been appointed to a Staff Fellowship at Trinity College, Cambridge. This is the first time. I am informed, that Trinity have appointed a geographer on their staff.

THE INQUIRER

All letters and manuscripts for the Editor must reach the Office not later than Monday morning for publication the same week. All communications must be accompanied by the name and address of the sender.

Subscription Rates: 17s. 4d. per annum (post free).

Those having any difficulty in obtaining copies of the paper should communicate direct with the publisher.

Address: 14 Gordon Square, London, W.C.1.

TEL.: BUS. 7554. Editorial: BUS. 2912

NEWS REVIEW

(We regret the delay in the appearance of a number of news items.)

HOPE STREET CHURCH

Liverpool Centenary.—Hope Street Church began its Centenary Celebrations on Sunday morning, October 16, with the usual Service, distinguished by special hymns, a special preacher in the person of the President of the General Assembly, the Rev. F. Cottier, and a special attendance, being double that of the customary number of worshippers. The Rev. Sidney Spencer participated in the Service. The Rev. Fred Cottier, in the course of his sermon, said that when Hope Street Church was built a hundred years ago, men were looking forward with great zeal to the building of a new world. They felt progress was inevitable. We thought differently today. We had lost something of the optimism and idealism that belonged to our fathers. We were said to have "gone off the rails", and reverted to barbarism and paganism. Allowing for a measure of exaggeration, there was certainly something wrong. Why, in a world of high production, were we wondering whether we should have enough to keep body and soul together? How was it, that, having so much we could enjoy, we used our resources for no better purpose than the destruction of young manhood, and the overthrow of culture? We needed faith and it was a faith that should be tested, it should be expressed in action, and what were our actions likely to be? Let action be dictated by sympathy and understanding. A hundred years ago the builders of Hope Street thought the country would soon be rid of credulity and orthodoxy, but we were living in a period of reaction, and it was necessary for those who belonged to that church to see that the interpretation of their faith should be made with a sense of sympathetic understanding.

The celebrations were continued on Tuesday, October 18, with a Public Meeting, presided over by the Lord Mayor of Liverpool, Alderman J. J. Clancy, J.P., who was accompanied by the Mayoress. To a crowded gathering, representative of Unitarian and other churches in the district, his Worship said it was a great happiness to bring civic recognition to the hundredth birthday of Hope Street Church, with its accumulated experience from the hard struggle to hold aloft the beacon-light of an unfettered religion.

Mr. P. M. Oliver, premising that the world was divided into two parts, "Liverpool and everywhere else", said he brought greetings from everywhere else to a church that had stood for a hundred years for social righteousness and the sanctity of peace. The Rev. Lawrence Redfern, bringing greetings from Ullet Road Church, declared that Hope Street might at times have seemed to set too hot a pace(!). They were proud of the great names of the past associated with Hope Street, of great scholars and prophets, and what we had inherited was not their way of seeing the truth, but the right to seek the truth for ourselves that lay at the heart of their predecessors' ideas. Miss Anne Holt, M.A., President of the Liverpool District Missionary Association, brought a message from Sir Richard Armstrong, son of the late Rev. R. A. Armstrong, a former minister of Hope Street, unable to be present through illness, while Canon Bezzant, Chancellor of the Liverpool Cathedral, said that though he was unable to bring official greetings from the Church to which he belonged, he had come with the knowledge of his immediate colleagues, and with their approval, "because they know, as I know, that I should have come without it"! If he were asked to say what Hope Street Church stood for, it seemed to him that it stood for one of the great truths that had constantly to be relearned, that nothing in the real meaning of the word could be true. The Rev. Sidney Spencer read a number of letters of greeting, one in particular from Mrs. Anita Mellor, widow of Dr. Stanley Mellor, who referred to her years at Hope Street as the happiest time of her life. In acknowledging the services of all who had spoken, Mr. Spencer said that the centenary of a Church had no meaning unless we built on the work of the builders. We looked back in order to look forward.

INCENTIVES IN A NEW SOCIAL ORDER

SOCIAL SERVICE CONFERENCE IN BIRMINGHAM

UNDER the auspices of the Social Service Department of the General Assembly the Autumn Conference of the Midland Christian Union was held at the Waverley Road Church, Small Heath, Birmingham, on Saturday, October 8. There was an attendance of over 80 persons drawn from 16 of the affiliated churches of the district. The President (Rev. P. C. Whiteman) presided. After devotions by the Rev. Dr. Meyer Kluegel he welcomed the appointed speaker, Dr. H. J. McLachlan, of Oxford, who proceeded to give an address on "Incentives in a new Social Order". Dangers in the new order, he said, might be summed up as loss of initiative, of drive, and the will to work; over-centralisation and the slackening of self-respect and independence of spirit; a tendency to lean on others' shoulders, and to prefer security.

To bring about a new outlook towards work, every child would

have to be taught both the privilege and the duty of work. Work-shyness and the false pride which looked down on certain forms of work should be exposed to contumely on every possible occasion.

Another change needed was the growth of a true regard for human personality. He suggested that in those sections of industry in which there was mass production and specialisation, too little attention was paid to human personality. The desire for creation was repressed and lost.

In opening the discussion which was well sustained till its close, Mr. A. Wynn Kenrick, of Birmingham, suggested that there were only two operative incentives—fear of hunger and the desire for power over others.

Other speakers were the Revs T. A. Gorton, H. Maguire, John Bright, Richard Lee, Gordon Stuart, and Mr. Harry Lennard, a "Free Catholic", going back to Mr. Lloyd Thomas's days.

Before the close the Rev. J. W. Dyer, Secretary of the Social Service Department, made an earnest appeal for increased contributions. The membership had grown last year.

At the close of the Conference, tea was kindly provided by the Waverley Road congregation.

Lincoln.—The Induction Service and Welcome Meeting for the new Minister, Rev. H. W. Kemshall, was held on Saturday, October 8. The Service was conducted by the Rev. C. H. Bartlett, of Hinckley, and the Charges to the Minister and Congregation were given with inspiring and impressive dignity by the Rev. Dr. G. Stephens Spinks, Editor of the *Hibbert Journal*, and Rev. Kenneth Twinn, of Mansfield.

Giving his Charge to the Congregation, the Rev. K. Twinn referred to the freedom of the Unitarian Minister to speak his convictions; to his dignity of office and willingness to serve. He urged the congregation to take on the administration of the chapel initiated by the Minister, thereby giving him freedom to study and follow different pursuits which would give him a broader outlook for leadership. The congregation should retain the spiritual side of worship and not become too mechanical in their organising.

In his Charge to Rev. H. W. Kemshall, Dr. Spinks said the right kind of relationship between minister and congregation was amongst the fullest of all relationships. To face the contemporary fact ministers required an integrity that was personal as well as intellectual. Such an integrity would enable parson and congregation to see the world with vision. Dr. Spinks urged Mr. Kemshall to cause his people to see the affairs of our time against the background of the Majesty of God.

Mr. Kemshall replied, saying he was sensitive to what had been said and the honour paid him in the invitation to become the minister of Lincoln Chapel. He would strive with honesty and integrity to fulfil that ministry. He wished to be true, not only intellectually, but to a vision of the highest—a vision of God—and sensible of the presence of God in the faces around him. He hoped that he might be a worthy successor to previous ministers.

Tea followed the Induction Service which was attended by visitors from all churches in the North Midland Association, Gainsborough and Norwich churches. Among other letters of good wishes two were received and read from Dr. A. Hall and Dr. S. H. Mellone, previous ministers at Lincoln. The organist, Mr. W. M. Harrison, was assisted by Miss E. Toyn, violinist, and Miss L. Toyn, 'cellist; and vocal solos were contributed by Miss C. Curt and Mrs. D. Somer.

CALENDAR

SUNDAY, October 30th

ABERDARE, Highland Place, 11, Supply, 6, Rev. D. JACOB DAVIS.
ABERDEEN, Un. Church, Skene St., 11 and 6, Rev. L. BAKER SHORT.
ABERYSTWYTH, New Street Meeting House, 11, Mr. D. L. C. MORGAN.
ACCRINGTON, Unitarian Free Church, Oxford St., 10.45 and 6, Rev. ERIC PHILLIPS.
AINSWORTH, Un. Chapel, Knowley Rd., 11 and 3, Rev. BENJAMIN GILL.
ALTRINCHAM, Dunham Road Chapel, 11 and 6.30, Rev. A. W. VALLANCE.
ANSDELL. (See Lytham St. Annes.)
ASHTON-UNDER-LYNE, Richmond St., 6.30, Rev. C. P. SCOTT.
ASTLEY, Unitarian Chapel, Manchester Rd., 11 and 6.30, Mr. J. MATHER.
BATH, Trim Street Chapel, Unitarian, 11 and 6.30, Rev. H. D. WIARD.
BELFAST, All Souls, Elmwood Av., 11.30 and 7, Rev. Dr. A. L. AGNEW.
BELFAST, First Church, Rosemary Street, 11.30 and 7, Rev. Dr. R. WILDE.
BESELS GREEN (nr. Sevenoaks), Unitarian Ch., 11, Rev. JOHN KIELTY.
BILLINGHURST, Free Church, South St., 11.15, Rev. J. MARTIN HALL.
BIRKENHEAD, Unitarian Ch., Bessborough Rd., 6.30, Mr. T. McLEOD.
BIRMINGHAM, Ch. of Messiah, Broad Street, 11 and 6.30, Rev. GORDON STUART.
BIRMINGHAM, Moseley, Unitarian Church, Yardley Wood Rd., 6.30, Mr. B. IERSTON.
BIRMINGHAM, Waverley Road Church and Hurst Street Mission, Small Heath, 6.30, Mrs. MEYER KLUegel.
BLACKBURN, Unitarian Church, St. Andrews St., 6.30, Supply.
BLACKPOOL, North Shore, Dickson Rd., 10.45 and 6.30, Rev. FRANK COLEMAN.
BLACKPOOL, South Shore, Lytham Rd., 11 and 6.30, Supply.
BOLTON, Bank St., 10.30 and 6.30, Rev. J. GORDON DAVIES.
BOLTON, Halliwell Rd., Free Ch., 10.45 and 6.30, Rev. W. STEPHENSON.
BOLTON, Unity Church, Deane Rd., 10.30 and 6.30, Rev. I. L. TOSELAND.
BOSTON (Lincoln), Spain Lane, Unitarian Ch., 6.30, Rev. CHAS. SIMPSON.
BOURNEMOUTH, Unitarian Ch., West Hill Rd., 11, Rev. H. J. ROSSINGTON.
BRADFORD, Broadway Av., 3.15, Rev. DUDLEY RICHARDS.
BRADFORD, Town Hall Square, 10.45 and 6.30, Rev. FRANK BULLOCK.
BRIDGWATER, Christ Church, Dampiet St., 11 and 6.30, Rev. W. G. TOPPING.

BRIDPORT, Unitarian Church, 11 and 6.30, Rev. G. RANDALL JONES.
BRIGHTON, Christ Ch., Unitarian, New Rd., 11, Mrs. JOYCE GOW, 6.30, Rev. F. M. RYDE.
BRISTOL, Lewin's Mead Meeting, 6.30, Rev. J. CORAM DAVIES.
BRISTOL, Oakfield Rd., Clifton, 11 and 6.30, Rev. CHARLES EASTON.
BURNLEY, Unitarian Church, Trafalgar St., 6, PASTOR J. S. HALLAM.
BURY, Bank St., 11 and 6.30, Rev. J. MAW.
BURY, Chesham Unitarian Church, 6.30, Mr. SCOTT L. JOHNSON.
BURY ST. EDMUNDS, Churchgate Street Chapel, 6.30, Rev. HAROLD GORE.
BUXTON, Hartington Rd., 11 and 6.30, Rev. J. W. DYER.
CAMBRIDGE, Memorial Ch., Emmanuel Rd., 11 and 6, Rev. STEWART CARTER.
CARDIFF, The West Grove Un. Church, 11 and 6.30, Rev. ERIC PUTIN.
CARLISLE, Unitarian Church, Lorne St., 2.30, Junior Church, 6.30, Rev. W. J. CARTER.
CHATHAM, Unitarian Church, Yamond Hill, 3, Br. ERIC RAMAGE.
CHELtenham, Bayshill Unitarian Church, 11, Study Service, 6.30, Rev. BARBARA THOMAS.
CHESTER, Matthew Henry's Ch., 11 and 6.30, Rev. R. H. WILLIAMSON.
CHESTERFIELD, Elder Yard Chapel, 10.45 and 6.30, Rev. E. STANLEY PETERS.
CHOWBENT CHAPEL, Atherton, 10.45 and 6.30, Rev. E. GLYN EVANS.
CORK, Prince's St., 11.30 and (occ.), 7, Rev. W. A. WEATHERALL.
COSELEY, Staffs., Old Meeting House, Old Meeting Rd., 11 and 6.30, Supply.
COVENTRY, New Great Meeting House, Holyhead Rd., 11 (Children's Church), 6.30, Rev. T. J. JONES.
CREWE, Free Christian Church, Beech St., 6.30, Mr. CLEWS.
CREWKERNE, Un. Ch., Hermitage St., 11 and 6.30, Rev. FRANCIS TERRY.
CROYDON, Free Christian Church, Wellesey Rd., 11, Rev. ARTHUR PEACOCK.
DEAN ROW, 10.45, Rev. E. E. WRIGLEY. STYAL, 6, Rev. E. E. WRIGLEY.
DENTON, Wilton Street Chapel, 11 and 6.30, Rev. JOHN GILL.
DERBY, Friar Gate Unitarian Chapel, 6.30, Rev. CONSTANCE HARRIS.
DITCHLING, Old Meeting House, 10.45, Rev. F. M. RYDE.
DONCASTER, Free Christian Church, Hall Gate, 11 and 6.30, Rev. G. W. PARKINSON.
DUBLIN, Stephen's Green, West, 11.30 and 7.30, Rev. JOHN McCLEERY.
DUDLEY, Old Meeting House, Wolverhampton St., 11 and 6.30, Rev. W. T. WILKINS.
DUKINFIELD, Old Chapel, Chapel Hill, 10.45 and 6.30, Rev. S. P. WHITEHOUSE.
DUNDEE, Un. Ch., Constitution Rd., 11 and 6.30, Rev. ALBERT WHITFORD.
EDINBURGH, St. Mark's Church, Castle Terrace, 11 and 6.30, Rev. W. B. TAVENER.
EVESHAM, Oat Street Chapel, 11, Supply, 6.30, Rev. PRIESTLEY PHILLIPS.
EXETER, George's Chapel, South St., 11 and 6.30, Rev. D. B. FRASER.
GAINSBOROUGH, Unitarian Ch., Trinity St., 6, Rev. R. W. KEMSHALL.
GEE CROSS, Hyde Chapel, 11 and 6.30, Supply.
GLASGOW, St. Vincent St. Un. Ch., 11 and 6.30, Rev. ALEXANDER REID.
7, Study Circle, Mrs. RHODA FRASER.
GLOSSOP, Fitzalan St., 2.30 and 6.30, Rev. H. G. WOODFORD.
GLOUCESTER, Barton Street Church, 6.30, Rev. B. L. GOLLAND.
GODALMING, Meadow Chapel, 6.30, Rev. G. MABEL BEAMES.
GUILDFORD, Ward Street Church, 11.15, Mr. A. G. TARRANT.
HALE CHAPEL, Hale Barns, 10.45, Rev. E. A. LEAR, 6.30, Rev. MILES WILLIAMS.
HALIFAX, Northgate End, 10.45 and 6.30, Supply.
HASTINGS, Free Chris. Ch., South Terrace, 11 and 6.30, Rev. DENBIGH HILTON.
HINCKLEY, Gt. Mt., Baines Lane, 11 and 6, Rev. C. H. BARTLETT.
HINDLEY, Presbyterian Church, off Market St., 10.45, Mr. T. FORSHAW, 6.30, Rev. W. WADDINGTON.
HOLLYWOOD, Kingswood, 11 and 6.30, Rev. T. A. GORTON.
HORSHAM, Worthing Rd., 6.30, Rev. J. MARTIN HALL.
HORWICH, Unitarian Free Church, 10.30 and 6.30, Supply.
HUDDERSFIELD, Fitzwilliam St., 11, Rev. DUDLEY RICHARDS.
HUNSLY, Unitarian Church, Joseph St., 6.30, Mr. A. G. WHITTAKER.
HULL, Park Street Church (Unitarian), 11, School Service, 6.30, Rev. RALPH PHILLIPSON.
ILMINSTER, Old Meeting, East St., 11 and 6.30, Rev. W. BEER.
IPSWICH, Unitarian Ch., Friars St., 11, Rev. HAROLD GORE.
KENDAL, Market Place Chapel, 11 and 6.30, Rev. E. W. DEAKIN.
KIDDERMINSTER, New Meeting House, 11 and 6.30, Rev. H. WHITTAKER.
KNUTSFORD, Brook St. Chapel, 11 and 6.30, Rev. STANLEY MOSSOP.
LANCASTER, St. Nicholas Street Church, 10.30 and 6.30, Rev. L. HALL.
LEEDS, Mill Hill Chapel, 10.45 and 6.30, Rev. E. SHIRVELL PRICE.
LEICESTER, Narborough Rd., 11, Junior Church, 6.30, Rev. E. G. GREEN.
LEICESTER, The Great Meeting, East Bond St., 11 and 6.30, Rev. LEONARD MASON.
LEIGH, Unitarian Church, Twist Lane, 11 and 6.30, Rev. J. PIPKIN.
LETHBRIDGE, Vasant Hall, Gerton Walk, 6.30, Church Anniversary, Rev. ARTHUR LONG.
LEWES, Westgate Chapel, 11, Supply.
LINCOLN, High St., Unitarian Church, 6.30, —.
LIVERPOOL, Ancient Chapel of Toxteth, 11 and 6.30, Rev. L. A. GARRARD.
LIVERPOOL, Bootle Free Church, 6.30, Supply.
LIVERPOOL, Domestic Mission, Mill St., 6.30, Rev. J. KEIR MURRIEN.
LIVERPOOL, Gateacre Chapel, 11 and 6.30, Rev. DUNCAN P. STEWART.
LIVERPOOL, Hamilton Rd., Everton, 6.30, Supply.
LIVERPOOL, Hope St., 11 and 6.30, Rev. SIDNEY SPENCER.
LIVERPOOL, Ullet Rd., 11 and 6.30, Rev. LAWRENCE REDFERN.
LONDON, Bell St., Edgware Rd., 6, Rev. WALTER LONG.
LONDON, Blackfriars Mission and Stamford Street Church, 6.30, Rev. E. G. LEE.
LONDON, Brixton, Effra Rd., 11, Rev. E. G. LEE.

LONDON, Essex Church, Palace Gardens Terrace, W.8, 11, 3 and 6.30, Rev. JOHN BALLANTYNE.
 LONDON, Forest Gate, Upton Lane, 6.30, Mr. F. LEWIS.
 LONDON, Golders Green, Hoop Lane, 11 and 6.30, Rev. JOHN CROFT.
 LONDON, Hackney, New Gravel Pit Church, Chatham Place, 6.30, Rev. W. H. CORDELL.
 LONDON, Hampstead, Rosslyn Hill, 11, Rev. G. E. HALE.
 LONDON, Highgate Hill, Unitarian Church, 11, Rev. G. J. G. GRIEVE.
 LONDON, Ilford, High Rd., 6.30, Miss M. GRIFFITHS.
 LONDON, Islington, Unity Church, Upper St., Preston Hall, 7, Rev. J. HINKINS.
 LONDON, Kilburn, Unitarian Chr. Ch., Quex Rd., 11 Mr. V. FOX.
 LONDON, Lewisham, Un. Ch., High St., 11, Rev. JOHN HINKINS.
 LONDON, Leytonstone, Lea Bridge Rd., Knotts Green, 6.30, Rev. ARTHUR PEACOCK.
 LONDON, Mansford St. Ch., Bethnal Green, 6.30, Rev. J. W. DUMBLE.
 LONDON, Newington Green, Unitarian Ch., 6.30, Mr. J. REECE WALKER.
 LONDON, Richmond Free Church, Ormond Rd., 11, Rev. ETHEL KAY.
 LONDON, Rhyl St., Kentish Town, 6.30, Rev. GORDON BEVERLEY.
 LONDON, Stratford, West Ham Lane, Unitarian Church, 11.30, Children's Church, 6.30, Rev. W. NEWTON.
 LONDON, Theistic Ch., 18 Great Marlborough St., W.1, 11, Rev. F. HANKINSON.
 LONDON, Wandsworth, Un. Church, East Hill, 11, Rev. W. M. LONG.
 LONDON, Welsh Unitarian Church, at Highgate Hill Unitarian Church, 6, 1st and 3rd Sundays. Nov. 7, Rev. A. J. MARTIN.
 LONDON, Wood Green, Unity Church, Newnham Rd., 6.30, Rev. F. HANKINSON.
 LOUGHBOROUGH, Victoria St., 6.30, Mr. T. GREGORY.
 LYTHAM ST. ANNES (ANSDALL), Unitarian Church, Channing Rd., 11 and 6.30, Rev. H. CRABTREE.
 MACCLESFIELD, King Edward St., 10.45 and 6.30, Rev. H. L. SHORT.
 MAIDSTONE, Unitarian Ch., Market Buildings, 6.30, Br. ERIC RAMAGE.
 MANCHESTER, Unitarian Church, Chapel Lane, Blackley, 10.45 and 6.30, Rev. K. SHERRATT.
 MANCHESTER, Cross St. Chapel, 10.45 and 6.30, Supply.
 MANCHESTER, Failsworth, Dob Lane Chapel, 10.45 and 6.30, Rev. W. HILL WAREING.
 MANCHESTER, Gorton, Brookfield Church, Hyde Rd., 10.45 and 6.30, Rev. T. COTTIER.
 MANCHESTER, Longsight Free Chr. Church, Birch Lane, 10.45 and 6.30, Supply.
 MANCHESTER, Mill Street Free Church, Bradford, 3, Mr. R. S. SALT.
 MANCHESTER, Monton Ch., Eccles, 10.45, and 6.30, Rev. G. L. CLARKE.
 MANCHESTER, Pendleton, Un. Cross Lane, 6.30, Rev. ELSPETH VALLANCE.
 MANCHESTER, Platt Chapel, Rusholme, 6.30, Rev. C. A. PIPER.
 MANCHESTER, Stand Chapel, Whitefield, 10.45 and 6.30, Rev. G. D. FOOTE.
 MANCHESTER, Wilbraham Road, Chorlton-Cum-Hardy, 6.30, Student U.C.M.
 MANCHESTER, Wythenshawe, Un. Church, Brownley Rd., Benchill, 6.30, Supply.
 MANSFIELD, Old Meeting House, 10.45 and 6.30, Rev. KENNETH TWINN.
 MEXBOROUGH, Free Christian Ch., 10.30 and 6.30, Rev. E. A. DAVIES.
 MIDDLESBROUGH, Christ Church, Unitarian, Corporation Rd., 6.15, Supply.
 MIDDLETON, Old Road Chapel, 6, Rev. J. EVANS.
 MORECAMBE, see Lancaster.
 MORETONHAMPTON, Cross Chapel, 3, Rev. C. G. TOONE.
 MOSSLEY, Christian Church, Stamford Rd., 10.45, Rev. W. WADDINGTON, 6, —.
 NANTWICH, Old Chapel, 6, Supply.
 NEWCASTLE-ON-TYNE, The Church of the Divine Unity, Ellison Place, 11 and 6.30, Rev. H. BARNES.
 NEWCASTLE, Staffs., Unitarian Old Meeting House, 6.30, Rev. W. J. McELDOWNEY.
 NEWCHURCH (Rossendale), Bethlehem Unitarian Church, Anniversary Services, 2.45 and 6, Rev. T. GORDON DAVIES.
 NEWPORT, L.O.W., Un. Ch., High St., 11 and 6.30, Rev. L. CHANDLER.
 NEWTON ABBOT, Albany St., 6.30, Rev. C. G. TOONE.
 NORTHAMPTON, Kettering Road Church, 11 and 6.30, Rev. A. E. MORRIS.
 NORWICH, Octagon Chapel, Colegate, 11, Rev. J. A. KENNEDY.
 NOTTINGHAM, High Pavement Chapel, 10.45 and 6.30, Rev. C. GORDON BOLAM.
 OLDHAM, Lord Street Church, 10.45 and 6.30, Rev. T. E. NUTTALL.
 OXFORD, Manchester College Chapel, 11.30, Rev. W. PRIESTLEY PHILLIPS.
 PARK LANE CHAPEL, near Wigan, 11 and 6.30, Rev. ALBERT SMITH.
 PADIHAM, Nazareth Un. Ch., Knight's Hill, 10.30 and 6, Supply.
 PLYMOUTH, Unitarian Centre, Houndiscombe Rd., 11 and 6.30, Rev. E. H. KERSLEY.
 POOLE, Unitarian Church, Hill St., 6.30, Rev. F. MUNFORD.
 PORTSMOUTH, Friends' Meeting House, Fratton Bridge, 6.30, Mr. STURGES.
 PRESTON, Unitarian Chapel, Church St., 6.30, Rev. ALUN WILLIAMS.
 PUDSEY, Un. Church, 10.30, Rev. T. BRETT DAVIES, 6, Mr. W. LLOYD.
 RAWTENSALL, Unitarian Ch., Bank St., 2.45 and 6, Mr. WM. MILLAR.
 RINGWOOD, Hants., The Meeting House, 1st, 3rd and 5th Sundays, 11, 2nd and 4th Sundays, 6.30, Rev. Dr. J. C. FLOWER.
 ROTHERHAM, Church of Our Father, 10.30 and 6.30, Supply.
 ROCKDALE, Blackwater St., 10.30 and 6, Farewell Services, Rev. E.D. DAVIES.
 SALE, Atkinson Rd., 11, Rev. C. A. PIPER.
 SCARBOROUGH, Un. Ch., Westborough, 10.30, Mr. C. SYKES.
 SHEFFIELD, Unity Church, Crooksmoor Rd., 11, Miss E. FREEMAN, 6.30, Mr. BROOKS.
 SHEFFIELD, Falwood Old Chapel, 11 and 6.30, Rev. D. T. EVANS.

SHEFFIELD (Attercliffe), 6.30, Mr. T. H. MOBBS.
 SHEFFIELD, Upper Chapel, 11 and 6.30, Rev. G. S. WHITBY.
 SHREWSBURY, High St., Unitarian, 11 and 6.30, Rev. A. H. LEWIS.
 SIDMOUTH, High St., Unitarian, 11 and 6.30, Rev. F. D. JONES.
 SOUTHAMPTON, Friends Meeting House, Ordnance Rd., 6, Mr. E. J. L. BISSON.
 SOUTHEND-ON-SEA, Darnley Road, 11, Children's Church, 6.30, Mrs. A. G. WILLIAMS.
 SOUTHPORT, Portland Street Church, 11 and 6.30, Rev. A. H. BIRTLES.
 STALYBRIDGE, Un. Ch., Canal St., 10.30 and 6.30, Rev. E. D. EVANS.
 ST. HELENS, Boundary Rd., St. Helen Workshops for the Blind, 6.30, Supply.
 STOCKPORT, Un. Ch., St. Peter's Gate, 10.30 and 6.30, Supply.
 STOCKTON-ON-TEES, Wellington St., 6.30, Rev. A. J. MARTIN.
 STOURBRIDGE, Presbyterian (Unitarian) Chapel, 11 and 6.30, Rev. ROSALIND LEE.
 SUNDERLAND, Bridge St., 11, Family Worship, 6.30, Mr. F. J. HAMBLIN.
 SWANSEA, Unitarian Church, High Street, 6.30, Rev. BASIL VINEY, Christian Meeting House, Pennard, 11, Rev. BASIL VINEY.
 SWINTON, Swinton Hall Rd., 10.45 and 6.30, Rev. J. H. SMITH.
 TAUNTON, Mary Street Church, 11, —, 6.30, —.
 TAVISTOCK, The Abbey Chapel, 6.30, Rev. ROSAMOND BARKER.
 TENTERDEN, Old Meeting House, Ashford Rd., 6.30, Supply.
 TODMORDEN, Unitarian Church, 10.45 and 6, Rev. MAURICE JOHNSON.
 TORQUAY, Unity Ch., off Higher Terrace, 6.30, Rev. C. W. TOWNSEND.
 TROWBRIDGE, Conigre Unitarian Ch., 11 and 6, Rev. A. F. O. THOMAS.
 WAKEFIELD, Westgate Chapel, 10.45, Mr. E. SHAW, 6.30, Youth Service, Mrs. KEEGAN.
 WALLASEY, Memorial Church, Manor Rd., 11 and 6.30, Rev. EDGAR HILL.
 WARRINGTON, Cairo Street, 10.30 and 6.30, Supply.
 WARWICK, High Street Church, 3, Rev. GORDON COOPER.
 WATFORD, Friends House, Derby Rd. (by permission), 7.30 on last Sunday in month. Oct. 30, Dr. R. O. JONES.
 WEST BROMWICH, Lodge Road Church, 11, Junior Church, 6.30, Rev. Dr. MEYER KLUEGEL.
 WEST KIRBY, Brookfield Gardens, 11 and 6.30, Rev. A. DAVID WILLIAMS.
 WHITBY, Flowergate Old Chapel, 6, Rev. LILLIAN PRESTON.
 WOLVERHAMPTON, All Souls' Church, 6.30, Rev. LESLIE KEMP.
 WOODHALL SPA, Mill Lane, 2.30, Rev. CHAS. SIMPSON.
 YORK, St. Saviourgate Chapel, 6.30, Rev. G. S. WOODS.
 THE NATIONAL UNITARIAN FELLOWSHIP provides for those unable to attend a Unitarian Church. For information write to the Secretary, the N.U.F., 14 Gordon Sq., W.C.1.

CANADA

MONTREAL, Church of the Messiah, Sherbrooke St. West, and Simpson St., 11, Rev. ANGUS CAMERON.
 TORONTO, First Unitarian Church, Jarvis St., 11, Rev. W. P. JENKINS.
 VANCOUVER, B.C., Unitarian Church of Vancouver, 1,550 Tenth Avenue West, 11, Rev. A. HODGKINS.
 WINNIPEG, First Federated Church, Sergeant and Banning; 11, English, 7, Icelandic, Rev. P. M. PETTURRESON.

AUSTRALIA

ADELAIDE, Un. Christian Church, Wakefield St., 11 and 7, Rev. COLIN GIBSON.
 MELBOURNE, Unitarian Church, Cathedral Place, C.2, 11 and 7.30, Rev. WM. BOTTOMLEY and Rev. V. JAMES. Monthly at 4.
 PERTH, Unitarian Free Christian Fellowship. Secker's Hall, 421 Wellington St., 11, Hon. Minister, R. H. FEATHERSTONE. Phone: W. 2875.
 SYDNEY, New South Wales, Unitarian Church, 15 Francis St., Hyde Park, 7.15, Rev. J. B. TONKIN.

ATTRACTIVE INVESTMENT

Interest on £10 Shares

2½ % NET

INCOME TAX PAID BY SOCIETY

Applications for prospectus to—

ATLAS
Building Society

DEPT. F.

162 BEDFORD ROAD

KEMPSTON—BEDFORD

Directors: W. R. HAUGHTON (Chairman) St. Mary, Lord AMYON P.C., D.L., I.P.
 A. S. FRANKLIN M.B.E. E. E. MARTELL GEO. BATTAN I.P.
 Secretary: HAROLD H. HARPER

THE LINDSEY PRESS

THE RELIGIOUS LIFE

Editor: G. STEPHENS SPINKS, M.A., Ph.D.

No. 1. THE QUIET MIND

By G. STEPHENS SPINKS, M.A., Ph.D.

No. 2. AFTER THIS MANNER

By LEONARD MASON, B.A., B.D.

No. 3. CONSIDER THE LILIES

By CHARLES M. KELLY, B.A.

No. 4. GOD BE IN MY HEAD

By JOHN C. BALLANTYNE, M.A. (double volume)

No. 5. IN THY NAME

By G. STEPHENS SPINKS, M.A., Ph.D.
(double volume)

No. 6. REVERENCE THROUGH SCHWEITZER

By MAGNUS C. RATTER

6d. each, double volumes 1s.
the set 4s. post free

THE LINDSEY PRESS

14 GORDON SQUARE, LONDON, W.C.1

Walthamstow Permanent Benefit Building Society

Founded 1877

Larkwood 2751 and 6776

Investment Opportunity

sums up to
£500

Now accepted on Share Account from New Shareholders

THE CURRENT RATE OF INTEREST IS

2½% per annum

Equals £4 1s. 10d. Gross

Income Tax borne by the Society

To the Secretary, Samuel H. Russell, F.C.G.S., F.R.Econ.S.
Walthamstow Permanent Benefit Building Society,
195 Hoe Street, Walthamstow, E.17

Name

Address

"IF ANY LITTLE SONG OF MINE"

New sacred song of great charm and appeal (by Harold T. Scull), price 2s. Key E^b and G.

From all music dealers, or:—

Francis, Day and Hunter, Ltd., 16 Soho Square, London, W.1.

THE MEMORIAL CHURCH, WALLASEY JUBILEE FAIR

FRIDAY, NOVEMBER 4th, at 3 p.m.

Opener: Miss ANNE HOLT (President of Liverpool District Association).

Chairman: Mr. J. H. WATTERSON (President of Manchester District Association).

SATURDAY, NOVEMBER 5th, at 3 p.m.

Opener: Professor ARTHUR HUMPHREYS, of Leicester.

Chairman: Mr. SYDNEY D. RIMMER (Treasurer of Liverpool District Association).

A cordial invitation is extended to members and friends from other congregations.

PENDLETON UNITARIAN FREE CHURCH CROSS LANE, MANCHESTER

75th ANNIVERSARY SALE OF WORK

on SATURDAY, OCTOBER 29th at 3.15p.m.

Opener : P. M. OLIVER, Esq. C.B.E., B.A.

Chairman : PRINCIPAL R. V. HOLT, B. Litt., M.A.

DONATIONS WILL BE GRATEFULLY RECEIVED BY
MR. E. N. JONES, 31 THURSFIELD STREET, SALFORD 6

HOLIDAY ACCOMMODATION

CORNWALL.—Falmouth, Suncourt Hotel. Spend the autumn and winter at the Suncourt. Special terms for long stays. Every comfort and personal attendance. Excellent Cornish food. Slumberland beds. H. & C.: Elec. fires in all bedrooms.—Write for brochure and terms. [5/11]

LONDON, Bed and Breakfast. Nightly or weekly. Moderate terms. Hot and cold all bedrooms.—Suffolk House, 86 Sussex Gardens, Hyde Park, W.2. PADDINGTON 5787. [29/10]

MINEHEAD, Somerset.—Harley House Hotel. This delightful hotel has an unrivalled reputation for comfort and cuisine. Open throughout the year.—Brochure on request from the Proprietors: Mr. and Mrs. R. Townsend. Tel. 879. [19/11]

S. DEVON for Climate and Beauty. Beautiful house with comfort. Central heating. H. and C. in all bedrooms. Excellent cuisine. Flower and vegetable gardens with produce for own consumption, also tennis court. Close to public travelling services for shopping centres. Few vacancies for permanent and visiting guests. Brochures upon request to:—J. H. Hollands, Blenheim Guest House, Bovey Tracey. Tel. 212211. [8/12]

MISCELLANEOUS

CARAVAN HOME. New condition. 1949. 17 ft. model. Four berths, two compartments. End kitchen, gas cooking, lighting, heating. Equipped. Originally £400. Accept £325. Bargain.—Box 1. INQUIRER.

VACANT PULPIT. Blackpool, South Shore, invite Ministers or Students to apply. House provided.—G. Atkins, 41 Roseacre, Blackpool.

VACANT PULPIT. Hindley Chapel invite ministers to apply for particulars to Rev. J. Kielty, Secretary of the General Assembly.

"THE UNITARIAN"

A lively illustrated monthly - - 3s. a year, post free.

Write Box TI, 29 Altrincham Road, Gatley, Cheshire.

ADVERTISEMENT RATES

24 words 4/- (min.); 2d. each additional word: 15/- extra for Box No. All Classified Advertisements, which should be pre-paid, should be addressed to: W. Horner & Sons, Printers, 115, Abchurch Lane, London, E.C.4.

Telephone: CHAncery 8753.

Display Rates on Application